REMARKS

Claims 1-29 were pending prior to amendment. Please add new claims 30-41. Claims 30-41 are supported in the specification; for example, at page 2, lines 11-15, and page 4, lines 5-8. Therefore, no new matter is added. Claims 1-29 stand rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over one or more of published U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0038844 to Royalty ("Royalty"), published U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0041206 to Dickie ("Dickie"), and U.S. Patent No. 6,545,862 to Gettemy et al. ("Gettemy"). In view of the amendments and remarks herein, the rejections are respectfully traversed. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

I. The Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and 103(a)

Claims 1-29 stand rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Royalty, alone or in combination with Dickie or Gettemy.

This contention has been obviated by the attached declarations by Lawrence A. Booth, Jr., and John F.L. Potts. This showing establishes the possession of the claimed subject matter prior to the filing date of Royalty. The declarations by Lawrence A. Booth, Jr., and John F.L. Potts and the attached Exhibit 1 provide a prima facie showing that the subject matter in claims 1-29 was conceived prior to August 21, 2001, the earliest priority date of Royalty.

After conception, and prior to August 21, 2001, Applicants worked diligently with patent attorneys who were members of Fish & Richardson P.C. to prepare a patent application that described the conceived invention. After this diligent preparation work, the above-referenced application was filed on November 28, 2001.

Based on the above, we respectfully submit that Royalty is no longer an effective reference under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and 35 USC 103(a). Therefore, the rejections based on Royalty should be withdrawn.

Additionally, claims 1-41 are patentable over the cited references for at least the following additional reasons.

Claim 1

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Royalty. However, Claim 1 is patentable because Royalty neither teaches nor suggests "operating in a first mode to display selected personal data originating with a personal information device (PID) in a first display area of a display," as recited in claim 1.

It is respectfully noted that the adjective "personal" means "of or relating to a particular person." (Please see the attached dictionary.com definition of the term "personal.")

The office action alleges that page 1, paragraph 0009, page 2, paragraph 0010, and page 3, paragraph 0026 teach this feature of claim 1. (Please see page 2 of the office action). However,

the cited portions of Royalty do not teach or suggest displaying any particular data, let alone "selected personal data." However, Royalty teaches on page 1, paragraphs 0003-0006 that Airline Modifiable Software or AMS data is displayed. AMS data is aviation data rather than data "of or relating to a particular person."

In the response to arguments section, the office action alleges that since a laptop computer can include "personal data," Royalty teaches displaying "selected personal data." However, it is respectfully noted that this is conjecture on the part of the office action, rather than a teaching or suggestion from the reference.

Further, since Royalty is directed to the problem of application spoofing, there is no teaching or suggestion that corrupted data would be personal data. Instead, if application spoofing were to occur, data that appears to be the desired data (i.e., spoofed aviation data) would be displayed, rather than personal data.

For at least the above reasons, claim 1 is patentable over Royalty.

Claims 2-41

Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1, and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons. Claims 6, 16, and 20 include features similar to those discussed above with respect

to claim 1, and are therefore patentable for at least similar reasons. Claims 7-15, 17-19, and 21-41 depend from the independent claims and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 3

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the combination of Royalty and Dickie. As noted in the previous response to office action, claim 3 is patentable for at least the additional reason that there is no motivation to modify Royalty with the teachings of Dickie, and vice versa.

In the response to arguments section, the office action alleges that "the laptop can display a variety of personal data, such as the flight crew's schedule information and weather data, which will help the flight crew navigate the aircraft instead of distract the crew; also, one of the objectives of Royalty is to detect application spoofing, so that the fight crew is aware of when information from a non-certified source is displayed; therefore, the display of personal data on the aircraft's flight deck display upon power-on allows the flight crew to be able to tell immediately that information from a non-certified source, which is vulnerable and subject to corruption, is displayed, enabling the flight crew to be aware of the potential problems." (Please see page 9-10 of the office action).

However, it is respectfully argued that this does not provide a motivation to modify Royalty to display "selected personal data." First, if the displayed data is personal data rather than aviation data, it would not "help the flight crew navigate," as alleged. It is agreed that there is motivation to display weather data on the flight deck. However, such data is not personal. Second, as noted above, if the data is spoofed data, it would be spoofed aviation data, rather than personal data.

For at least the additional reason that there is no motivation to modify the teachings of Royalty with the teachings of Dickie, claim 3 is patentable over the references.

New claims 30-41

New claims 30-41 have been added, further emphasizing patentable aspects of applicant's disclosure. For example, new claim 30 recites "the personal information device comprises a handheld personal information device configured to execute at least an email program and a calendaring program." Such a feature is neither taught nor suggested in Royalty, and it would not have been obvious to modify Royalty to include such a feature.

New claim 31 recites that the method further comprises "dynamically configuring a size of the first display area." None of the cited references, either individually or in

combination, teach or suggest such a feature. For at least these additional reasons, claims 30-41 are patentable over the references.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue, or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Claims 1-41 are in condition for allowance, and a notice to that effect is respectfully solicited. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this response, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (858) 678-4311.

Applicant asks that all claims be allowed. Please apply $600.00 for excess claim fees and any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 03/15/2005

Linda G. Gunderson
Reg. No. 46,341

Fish & Richardson P.C.
PTO Customer Number: 20985
4350 La Jolla Village Drive, Suite 500
San Diego, CA 92122
Telephone: (858) 678-5070
Facsimile: (858) 678-5099
10470321.doc